FILED

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

FEB 15 2008

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS CATHY A. CATTERSON, CLERK U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

MIRIAN GONZALEZ SANCHEZ,

Petitioner,

v.

MICHAEL B. MUKASEY, Attorney General,

Respondent.

No. 07-72064

Agency No. A95-297-003

MEMORANDUM*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted February 11, 2008 **

Before: WALLACE, LEAVY and RYMER, Circuit Judges.

This is a petition for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order dismissing petitioner's appeal.

A review of the administrative record and petitioner's response to this court's November 9, 2007 order to show cause demonstrates that there is

^{*} This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

^{**} The panel unanimously finds this case suitable for decision without oral argument. See Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

substantial evidence to support the BIA's decision that petitioner failed to establish continuous physical presence in the United States for a period of not less than ten years as required for cancellation of removal. *See* 8 U.S.C.

§ 1229b(b)(1)(A); Lopez-Alvarado v. Ashcroft, 381 F.3d 847, 851 (9th Cir. 2004); Jimenez-Angeles v. Ashcroft, 291 F.3d 594, 602-03 (9th Cir. 2002) (holding that the ten years of physical presence requirement for certain aliens and not others does not violate equal protection). Accordingly, this court sua sponte summarily denies this petition for review because the questions raised therein are so insubstantial as not to require further argument. See United States v. Hooton, 693 F.2d 857, 858 (9th Cir. 1982) (per curiam).

All other pending motions are denied as moot. The temporary stay of removal and voluntary departure confirmed by Ninth Circuit General Order 6.4(c) and *Desta v. Ashcroft*, 365 F.3d 741 (9th Cir. 2004), shall continue in effect until issuance of the mandate.

PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.